

VZCZCXYZ0001
PP RUEHWEB

DE RUEHKV #0316 0441553
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
P 131553Z FEB 09
FM AMEMBASSY KYIV
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 7299

C O N F I D E N T I A L KYIV 000316

SIPDIS

EUR/PRA, ISN/MTR, ISN/NDF

E.O. 12958: DECL: 02/13/2019
TAGS: [MTCRE](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [UP](#)
SUBJECT: SITE SURVEY PURSUANT TO ELIMINATION OF UKRAINE'S
SCUDS (C)

REF: A. 2008 KYIV 2339
[1](#)B. 2008 STATE 132581
[1](#)C. CATIPON/PALMIERO EMAIL 2/12/09

Classified By: Political Counselor Colin Cleary. Reasons 1.4 (b,d).

Summary

[1](#)1. (C) Following up on the November 17 meeting in Kyiv (ref a) and subsequent demarche (ref b), Embassy met with Acting Head of the Economic Department of Ukraine's Ministry of Defense Novosiolev to discuss progress on possible cooperation to eliminate Ukraine's SCUD missiles. Emboff briefed Novosiolov on the addition of the State Department as an executive agent to the CTR Umbrella Agreement, and noted that we would like to bring a site survey team to Ukraine in late April-early May, but must begin serious planning if we are to keep to this time frame. Novosiolev agreed that detailed planning is needed and found our proposed time frame for the site survey acceptable. He requested an expert-level visit to plan in earnest. He noted that the draft MoU for the project is nearly ready for interagency review. End Summary.

MOD a Committed Partner

[1](#)2. (C) Novosiolev reiterated the MoD's serious interest in pursuing this project with the U.S., and noted that the MoD has nearly completed its internal review of the draft MoU passed in the November meeting. The next step will be to seek interagency approval of the MoU and its annexes, which detail the types of equipment and their disposition. From MoD's perspective, there is no problem with the time frame we have proposed for the site survey.

[1](#)3. (C) To that end, MoD is interested in further expert-level discussions as soon as possible to flesh out the details of the site survey and to map out the project itself (to the greatest extent possible in advance of the site survey), including enough detail to develop reliable cost estimates for the MoD. Novosiolev asked if we could share as an example the details of our experience with any previous SCUD elimination projects in the region to gain a better understanding of what would be expected of Ukraine. As in the November meeting, he referred to the concerns of the Ministries of Economy and Finance that considerable effort be made to employ Ukrainian subcontractors or laborers, and that Ukraine avoid the destruction of any salable equipment.

Site Survey Logistics

[1](#)4. (C) Specific to the site survey itself, Novosiolev advised that there are as many as 20 sites around Ukraine. He asked whether the U.S. would prefer to review the general inventory of these sites in order to indicate what really

needs to be inventoried, and then MoD could consolidate these items in as few sites as possible. He observed that 20 sites would take some time to catalogue one by one, and suggested we might also want to consider whether to split the survey team into two groups if we need to visit all twenty. Novosiolev laid down a marker that Ukraine would prefer that destruction actually take place at one or two consolidated locations, but did not focus discussion on this issue.

Comment

15. (C) The interagency review of the MoU may raise opposition from the Ministries of Economy and Finance, which do not have a particular interest in arms control per se. In part to avoid problems similar to those suffered by the ill-fated NATO PfP Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) project, MoD would like to have a detailed proposal to present at the outset of the interagency review in order to forestall later objections by the Ministry of Economy and/or Finance.
TAYLOR